IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA, CHANDIGARH.

Civil Writ Petition No. 15005 of 2006
Date of Decision: 28.9.2006

Lala Bhagwan Dass Education Trust ..Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others ..Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Viney Mittal
Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.S.Bhalla

PRESENT:-Mr. Ashwani Talwar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S.Guglani, Advocate,Central Government
Standing Counsel for respondent No.2.

Mr. Ajay Gulati, AAG, Haryana
for respondent No.3.

Mr. Veer Bhan Singla, Advocate
for Ms. Daya Chaudhary, Assistant Solicitor
General of India.

Dr. Bal Ram Gupta, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Pankaj Sharma, Advocate
for the University.

VINEY MITTAL,J. (ORAL)

The petitioner-Trust has approached this Court with a grievance that although the Central Government had sanctioned an intake capacity of 100 seats in the B.D.S. Course for the academic Session 2006-07 in the Dental College run by the petitioner, but the Dental Council of India, respondent No.2, has permitted only an intake capacity of 90 seats. According to the petitioner-Trust, the action of the aforesaid Dental Council of India, is wholly unjustified and without jurisdiction.

A short reply on behalf of respondent No.2, Dental Council of India, has been filed in court today. The same is taken on record.

Various pleas have been raised in the aforesaid short reply by the Dental Council of India. Various documents have also been appended along with the short reply.

However, at this stage, we need not to go into the various pleas raised by the petitioner-Trust as well as the contest offered to the aforesaid pleas by Dental Council of India, inasmuch as, Shri M.S.Guglani, learned Standing Counsel for the Dental Council of India, respondent No.2, on a specific instruction, has stated that the Dental Council of India, had merely made a recommendation to the Central Government to permit the petitioner-Trust an intake capacity of 90 seats in the B.D.S. Course for the academic Session 2006-07, but a final decision was required to be taken only by the Central Government.

In view of the aforesaid stand taken by learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2, we find that the grievance made by the petitioner-Trust, at this stage, is wholly pre-mature.

Writ petition is disposed of as pre-mature.

(VINEY MITTAL)
JUDGE

(H.S.BHALLA)
JUDGE

28.9.2006
VK